

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

SAMUEL SCOTT, ¹	§	
	§	No. 331, 2008
Petitioner Below,	§	
Appellant,	§	Court Below—Family Court of
	§	the State of Delaware in and for
v.	§	Kent County
	§	
NANCY SCOTT,	§	
	§	File No. CK88-4726
Respondent Below,	§	Pet. No. 07-17784
Appellee.	§	

Submitted: November 14, 2008

Decided: January 30, 2009

Before **HOLLAND, BERGER** and **JACOBS**, Justices.

ORDER

This 30th day of January 2009, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The *pro se* appellant seeks review of the Family Court’s ancillary decisions of June 2, 2008, that divided the parties’ marital property, assigned a percentage of the appellant’s military benefits to the appellee, and awarded alimony to the appellee. In his opening brief on appeal, the appellant requests that the Court return the matter to the Family Court for “a new hearing.”² The appellee has filed a motion to affirm.³

¹ By Order dated July 2, 2008, the Court *sua sponte* assigned pseudonyms to the parties. Del. Supr. Ct. R. 7(d).

² The appellant’s opening brief consists of a one-page letter.

³ Del. Supr. Ct. R. 25(a).

(2) It is manifest on the face of the appellant's opening brief that this appeal is without merit.⁴ The Court has carefully considered the parties' positions and the Family Court record, including the transcript of the June 2, 2008 property division hearing that the appellant ordered for this appeal. The Court can discern no legal error or abuse of discretion on the part of the Family Court with respect to its division of the parties' marital property, assignment of benefits to the appellee and/or grant of alimony to the appellee.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the motion to affirm is GRANTED. The judgments of the Family Court are AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Carolyn Berger
Justice

⁴ See *Wife (J.F.V.) v. Husband (O.W.V., Jr.)*, 402 A.2d 1202, 1204 (Del. 1979) (providing that this Court's review of appeals from the Family Court extends to a review of the facts and the law as well as a review of the inferences and deductions made by the trial judge).